

***Village of Barrington  
Plan Commission  
Minutes***

Date: June 24, 2003

Time: 7 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Anna Bush, Chair  
Curt Larsen, Vice Chair  
Bhagwant Sidhu  
Harry Burroughs  
Steve Mack

Staff Members: Jim Wallace, Director, Building & Planning  
Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordinator

***Call to Order***

Ms. Bush called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

Roll call noted the following: Anna Bush, Chairperson, present; Curt Larsen, Vice Chair, present; Bhagwant Sidhu, present; Harry Burroughs, present; Steve Mack, present; John Rometty, absent; Steve Morrissey, absent.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Ms. Bush announced PC03-06 will be deferred to the end of the meeting.

Ms. Bush announced the order of the petitions and the procedure.

***New Business***

**PC 03-03 Barrington Park District (511 Lake Zurich Road) – Public Hearing.**

*Petitioners: Barrington Park District.*

Mr. Larsen recused himself.

Ms. Bush announced that there were very limited issues in front of the PC tonight. The final park plan would not be in question this evening.

Ms. Bush swore in anyone who would be testifying.

*Susan Jantornie, Petitioners' Legal Representation.*

Ms. Jantornie gave an introduction to the Park District's representation and their expertise.

*Jim Lundmark, Architect for the Park District.*

Mr. Lundmark handed out a packet that summarized all of the material that the Plan Commission had been given. He stated his company's involvement with the Park District. Mr. Lundmark stated that his firm, The Stratford Company, was under contract with the Park District for long-range planning goals.

Mr. Lundmark gave an overview of the Park District's request for rezoning and a Planned Development. Mr. Lundmark provided a history of the referendum and read the question. Mr. Lundmark explained how

the Park District had stayed in contact with the Plan Commission relative to the former Jewel Tea property. He discussed letters from the Park District to the Plan Commission dated November 6, 2002; the Park District had submitted to the Plan Commission on April 11, 2003 and a letter followed on June 10, 2003.

Mr. Lundmark discussed what would be included in Phases One and Two.

Mr. Lundmark explained what the Park District has done to prepare the site for demolition and redevelopment. He went over three key aspects of the redevelopment.

1. Site Remediation – Mr. Lundmark discussed some of the environmental remediation that has occurred.
2. Building Demolition – Mr. Lundmark stated that demolition was scheduled for August pending Village approvals. Mr. Lundmark explained the process the Park District had gone through with Village staff members. Mr. Lundmark stated that the buildings presented a liability and the Park District was requesting immediate removal of them.
3. Planning of the Park – Mr. Lundmark stated that the Park District was petitioning the Village of Barrington because the citizens had passed a referendum to turn that property into a park.

*Mr. David Thoma, Architect for the Park District.*

Mr. Thoma presented a brief overview of the Park District's plans for the project. Mr. Thoma showed the plans on the overhead projector. Mr. Thoma gave an overview of how the Park District would change the site from a manufacturing site to a park.

Mr. Thoma discussed changes to Lake Zurich Road. Mr. Thoma went over the site's natural assests.

Ms. Bush asked about the existing building that would remain. She wondered if it would be enlarged.

Mr. Thoma said that at this point the "aerosol" building would not enlarged at this time, but it may be in the future.

Ms. Bush asked Mr. Thoma to outline the path of the current Lake Zurich Road over the plan.

Mr. Thoma read a letter to the Park District relative to the need for indoor recreation space and the former Jewel Tea building.

*Mr. Charles Hasbrook, Gonzalez & Hasbrook, Historic Architect for the Park District.*

Mr. Hasbrook gave an overview of his experience with historic preservation architecture. Mr. Hasbrook discussed his relationship to the PD and the former Jewel Tea property. He explained that his firm was to give an objective opinion regarding the relationship between the former Jewel Tea building and the Barrington Historic District. Mr. Hasbrook summarized those findings. He stated that the Jewel Tea building was very different from the structures located in the Historic District.

Mr. Hasbrook gave an review of the architecture of the former Jewel Tea Building. He presented a details about the building's architecture. Mr. Hasbrook said in his firm's opinion, that the Jewel Tea building was not a significant piece of architecture. He compared the architecture of the Jewel Tea Building to other Holibred & Root's buildings. Mr. Hasbrook said the building did not deserve landmark status.

Mr. Hasbrook discussed the architectural issues surrounding the adaptive reuse of the building.

Ms. Bush asked if Mr. Hasbrook had had any contact with the Illinois State Historic Preservation Agency. Ms. Bush also asked about the continuity of the building with the rest of the Historic District.

Mr. Hasbrook stated that he had no direct contact with IHPA and that he was aware that the building was not contiguous with the rest of the Historic District.

*Mike Williams, Architect for the Park District.*

Mr. Williams stated his experience in the field of architecture. Mr. Williams discussed the demand for a community center. Mr. Williams stated the challenges to reusing the Jewel Tea building for park usage. He stated that the structure of the building would cause adaptive reuse to be extremely cost prohibitive.

Mr. Williams discussed typical needs for community centers. Mr. Williams gave examples of other communities' community centers. He discussed parking needs if the building was reused as a community center. Mr. Williams discussed finances of community centers.

*Mark Bushhouse, architect for the Park District.*

Mr. Bushhouse discussed the finances of rehabbing the building. He stated that the very basic rehab would cost \$25 million. Mr. Bushhouse stated that there would be other costs to modify the building so that it is acceptable for Park District reuse.

*Terry Jennings, Director of the Park District.*

Ms. Jennings discussed the contacts that the Park District had with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA). Ms. Jennings discussed a letter dated July 31, 2002 from Ted Hill of the IHPA. Ms. Jennings explained that the Park District had sent a letter back to the IHPA dated August 21, 2002. Ms. Jennings explained that the Park District was trying to fulfill their promise to the voters, but that there was tremendous interference with the Park District ability to get grants.

Ms. Jennings explained the direction that the IHPA told the Park District to take relative to the Jewel Tea Building. Ms. Jennings discussed an on-site meeting with Ann Hacker, Deputy Director of the IHPA. Ms. Jennings stated that Ms. Hacker explained why the building was historically significant. Ms. Jennings stated that the IHPA had given the Park District the okay to demolish the building because the Park District had done their due diligence.

Ms. Jennings discussed the adaptive reuse of the building relative to the IHPA. She stated that the IHPA has required a HABS report for the building. Ms. Jennings stated that the work was done on June 7, 2003.

Ms. Jennings stated that a second letter has appeared from the IHPA on June 23, 2003 after the alternative proposal for a community center was presented.

Ms. Bush proposed a five-minute recess.

Ms. Bush reconvened the meeting at 8:40 PM.

*Chris Roggamine, Barrington Citizens for Open Space.*

Ms. Roggamine gave an overview of the history of the property and the buildings after Jewel left the building. She discussed the length of time that had been spent on planning an open space area. Ms. Roggamine discussed the forum that was held in Spring 2001 relative to use of the Jewel Tea property. She noted that there were several options for the property, but in the end the vote was for a park. The March 2002 referendum was developed from these forums.

*Linda Hoevde, Barrington Citizens for Open Space.*

Ms. Hoevde gave a computer presentation of the Jewel Tea Building as it currently exists. She showed pictures of the exterior and interior of the building as it currently exists.

*Peg Cullen, Vice President, Barrington Citizens for Open Space.*

Ms. Cullen discussed the ongoing maintenance costs for the Jewel Tea Building. Ms. Cullen compared the reuse of the Jewel Tea Building as a community center to the Village of Arlington Heights' community center. The Jewel Tea Building is five times the size of the Arlington Heights community center. Ms. Cullen stated that the adaptive reuse was too expensive. Ms. Cullen stated that the Park District should not be a landlord. She stated that the dreams of the community center would cost the taxpayers money. Ms. Cullen stated that the building was just too big.

Ms. Janatornie directed the PC to the purchase agreement.

*Ms. Christine Gary, President of the Park District Board.*

Ms. Gary discussed why the Park District decided to purchase the property. She explained the studies that the Park District had ordered to determine the quality and condition of the site. Ms. Gary discussed the process that the Park District had taken to explore renovation of the Jewel Tea Building. Ms. Gary explained the contract that the Park District entered into with the former owner of the Jewel Tea site. She stated that the contract was conditional upon both referendum questions passing in March of 2002. Ms. Gary stated that renovation of the building did not take place because the burden to the taxpayers would be too high. She further stated that had the citizens' group been around when during consideration of the purchase, the Park District would have never entered into a contract to purchase the land. Ms. Gary went over five major issues relative to the preservation of the Jewel Tea Building.

1. Referendums were passed by the citizens of Barrington
2. The land has been purchased and remediation has taken place
3. "Sizeable" state and local grants were being compromised by the latest efforts to save the building
4. Renovation of a 200,000 square foot building would have required a bond issuance upwards of \$30 Million, which would have been an unreasonable amount to request from the taxpayers.
5. There is no new critical evidence surrounding the issue of demolition. A community center use would still require that the 200,000 square foot building be used as office space.

Ms. Gary stated that the decision-makers had a clear path to follow. She stated that the people had spoken through the referendum, the people had spoken. Ms. Gary urged the Plan Commission to grant approval so that the Park District can move forward. She stated that after hearing the alternate plan, the Park District has determined that the park use and the community center use would not be compatible.

*Mr. Lee Howard, Financial Consultant for the Park District.*

Mr. Howard explained how the Park District was paying for this project. Mr. Howard discussed the legal ramification of delaying the process any further regarding the bonding. He stated that the Park District was unable to sell the building without a referendum. Mr. Howard stated that the Park District could not financially operate the building.

Ms. Janatornie directed Plan Commission to the bond ordinances and other financial documents. Ms. Janatornie explained what it would take to sell the property to another group.

Ms. Bush asked if the meeting on July 8, 2003 could be from 6:30 – 9:30 pm.

#### **STAFF REPORT**

Mr. Wallace gave the Staff Report. He explained what the request was for.

Mr. Burroughs asked about the elimination SPA designation.

Mr. Wallace discussed that the Planned Development would still protect the site.

Mr. Wallace provided an update on the Comprehensive Plan amendment from the June 23, 2003 BOT Meeting. He said the amendment was passed unanimously. Mr. Wallace continued to state that Point #9 of the Staff Report gave deference to the referendum to decide the fate of the building.

Mr. Wallace stated the ARC recommendation for the Phase One PD. The recommendation was against the Phase One Planned Development.

#### **REBUTTAL**

Ms. Janatornie stated that she thought the ARC's concerns were addressed in tonight's presentation.

Ms. Bush stated that Charles White presented a letter for the record regarding this property.

MOTION: Mr. Mack moved to continue the hearing to July 8, 2003 at 6:30 PM at Village Hall. Mr. Burroughs seconded. Voice vote recorded all yes.

***Adjournment***

Mr. Burroughs moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Mack seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all Ayes. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordinator

---

Anna Bush, Chairperson  
Plan Commission